

# **Reform Roadmap**

1999-2000

USAID

## USAID 1999-2000 Reform Roadmap

### Executive Summary

This reform plan or “roadmap” was drafted in response to requests from Agency staff and partners for a clear statement describing the goals and focus of USAID’s on-going reform efforts. The Agency Strategic Plan describes the overall mission of USAID and the goals we aim to achieve, and the International Affairs Strategic Plan describes how USAID goals and those of other foreign affairs Agencies work together to support U.S. national interests. These strategies describe *what we do*. To remain relevant and succeed, USAID must focus increasingly on *how we work* and look for ways to do our work more efficiently, with more continuous learning and adapting. Below is the vision of *how* we want to work as we enter the twenty-first century. This vision summarizes what we hope to achieve through reform.

#### Reform Vision

USAID seeks to evolve into a model twenty-first century international development agency that has the operational flexibility, technical skills, and institutional strength to meet twenty-first century global challenges. This means:

- ☐ Being dynamic and proactive in addressing both long-term development challenges and shorter-term crises that undermine sustained progress
- ☐ Selecting the most worthwhile goals, achieving success consistently, and demonstrating our impact
- ☐ Being recognized as a highly valued partner by our colleagues in other U.S. foreign affairs agencies, public, private and international donor organizations, and host country institutions
- ☐ Having a strong and flexible field presence which enables us to devise better programs, implement them more quickly, and avoid costly mistakes
- ☐ Applying the lessons of successes and failure systematically, and providing leadership in tackling complex problems that demand multi-agency or multi-donor responses
- ☐ Working more effectively and collaboratively with our implementing partners
- ☐ Improving our internal processes so that they are less costly to operate, more productive, and much more responsive to the customers they serve, both inside and outside of USAID

This vision calls for an organization that has USAID’s experience, field presence, and capabilities, but which is more consistent, flexible, responsive, and efficient than ever before. Achieving improvements requires organizational transformation from a traditional hierarchy model, in which work is fragmented into specialized tasks and there is intensive use of rules and regulations to specify appropriate action, to a more seamless structure, which focuses much more on desired outcomes and allows greater organizational flexibility for achieving them. A common starting point in reforming traditional organizations involves use of explicitly stated core values to guide behavior and decision-making from a higher plane. In this context, core values serve as a broad statement on the behaviors that are sought in a wide range of situations. USAID’s **five core values (Managing for Results, Customer Focus, Teamwork and Participation, Empowerment and Accountability, and Valuing Diversity)** are typical of organizations going through such a reform process. They serve as a centerpiece and reference point for all reform efforts.

Institutional reforms are typically introduced in a three-stage process involving design, implementation, and alignment phases. The latter phase is considered essential to success, as new systems must be adjusted to each other to work well. In USAID, the design phase for the reforms occurred during 1994 and 1995, and initial implementation for the next two years. Since 1998, the Agency has been engaged in aligning systems and approaches to benefit fully from the reforms. Since organization-wide reforms typically require three to ten years to become fully institutionalized, the next two to three years will be critical to consolidate changes and achieve tangible and lasting performance improvements. If we slow down at this stage, we will be left with an incompatible mix of old and new structures, guidance, and processes, and the desired performance improvements will not materialize.

At the **Agencywide level**, reform efforts over the next two years will concentrate on four priority areas: strengthening reform leadership, improving performance of critical Agencywide systems, Washington-field relations, and training.

- **Strengthening Reform Leadership**

The 1998 stocktaking found a need for strong leadership in promoting reform efforts. Some Agency managers and staff have applied reforms with excellent results. Too many have felt stymied, however, by a sense that the hierarchy does not provide adequate support or follow-through. This broadly felt concern is recognized in management literature as a common problem faced by organizations seeking to implement change. To address this issue, steps are being taken to **improve teamwork and decision-making at senior management levels, clarify reform leadership, recognize and reward executive leadership, and ensure authoritative interpretation of operational policies and procedures.**

- **Improving Agencywide Systems**

In carrying out its work across the globe, USAID depends on seven interrelated management systems that cut across bureau and office boundaries. These are: **managing for results, funding allocation, acquisition and assistance, funds accounting, workforce management, information management, and policy and procedures guidance (ADS).** Washington-level reform efforts will continue to focus on and better align these systems. The objectives are to reduce cost, improve performance, promote the core values more consistently, and thereby allow a greater portion of resources to be applied to achieving development results in the field. To achieve this, individuals have been named as responsible for overall functioning of each system. Staff and partner feedback will be sought to assess system performance and identify conflicts. Effective teamwork across organizational boundaries will be needed to make improvements.

- **Improving Washington-Field Relations**

Cultivating results-management at a Washington level means shifting emphasis from the traditional input-focused, second-guessing approach, to one that is led by a sense of shared responsibility for results achievement. With this emphasis, bureaus can focus on streamlining and reducing bureaucratic requirements and responding effectively to staffing constraints and other bottlenecks affecting field efforts. Significant coordination issues have been identified with respect to certain central bureau programs and missions. In particular, efforts are underway to **improve Washington-field relations with respect to program and staffing support to missions, information flow and coordination between field and centrally managed programs, and clarification of roles and responsibilities at the field level with respect to the Department of State.** While full resolution will depend in part on better information technology (under development), much can be done in the short term simply through better communication among units (formal and informal). Each bureau will develop specific efforts to address these issues.

- **Intensifying Reform-Related Training**

Reform efforts are highly dependent on training and learning to be successful. The Office of Human Resources, in close collaboration with system experts and practitioners throughout the Agency, is designing and implementing a new Agencywide training program focused on our new planning and management systems. Effort will be made to include partner organizations where useful and appropriate. Portions of this program that specifically relate to reform efforts include **a leadership and program operations program, and a new competency-based technical program.**

At the **operating unit level**, each mission and Washington operating unit is asked to develop its own reform action plan. These plans should aim to promote the reform vision and core values described in the Reform Roadmap and focus around the following six themes: **strengthen strategic objective team functioning, improve internal customer services, promote results-oriented management that involves partners and customers, reduce and update mission notices to reflect SO team structures and core values, use staff performance appraisals to encourage reforms, and selective reengineering efforts targeted at missions level processes that need streamlining.**

AA/PPC Tom Fox and AA/M Terry Brown are responsible for leading and tracking USAID's reforms. Points of contact for further information: Olivier Carduner, PPC/PC, 202-712-4976; and Carrie Johnson, M/AA, 202-712-5299.

## **I. Introduction**

This reform plan or “roadmap” was drafted in response to requests from Agency staff and partners for a clear statement describing the goals and focus of USAID’s on-going reform efforts. Through the 1998 reform stocktaking effort involving 600 USAID staff and 300 partner respondents, as well as a number of other meetings and fora, the need to complete and deepen the reform efforts initiated in 1993 was clearly expressed.

This roadmap incorporates existing but not well known initiatives, and outlines new ones intended to consolidate changes and achieve tangible improvements in our operations. It addresses recognized frustrations and difficulties by specifying more clearly what we seek to achieve over the next two years, and by outlining new efforts to encourage reform leadership at all levels. This plan incorporates feedback obtained at the November 1998 worldwide Mission Directors’ Conference. It represents the efforts of senior Agency leadership in all bureaus to ensure that reforms are effectively institutionalized, and should be seen as a corporate plan that all bureau heads endorse and support. Finally, the roadmap provides the structure for consulting and reporting to the Hill, OMB, and the Department of State on USAID reforms.

After providing a rationale and vision of what USAID seeks to achieve with reforms, this paper outlines the type of institutional changes needed (section II) and how we are getting there (section III). Lessons learned to date are presented in section IV as a “reality check” to inform future action. The 1999-2000 reform plan is described in sections V and VI. This is supplemented by a detailed listing of specific actions in annex A. This annex will be updated periodically and used to track progress. A concluding section describes how reform progress will be assessed and reported on.

## **II. Where Are We Going and Why?**

The challenge faced by USAID is how to stay relevant and effective as a foreign affairs agency in the face of three main sources of change:

- ❑ The evolution of development needs and challenges in the post-Cold War period including:
  - the rise of global environment, health, and crime concerns
  - a new international context with greater cross-border economic opportunities and risks
  - increased need to manage “failed state” transitions
  - greater demand for natural and man-made disaster recovery and mitigation
  - increased receptivity of host governments to work with nongovernment entities, and corresponding rise in the capacity of private organizations to contribute to development processes
- ❑ The requirement to operate with significantly increased flexibility and efficiency; our staff and budgets are smaller, but our mission is not shrinking.
- ❑ The need to meet new U.S. government results-focused management standards introduced through the GPRA and GMRA legislation.

Part of the answer to addressing this challenge lies in improving our coordination with the Department of State and other USG foreign affairs agencies, and together, finding more effective ways to define and pursue U.S. national interests and goals. More profoundly however, the changes described above have forced us to re-examine what we do as a development Agency and how we do it.

The Agency Strategic Plan describes the overall mission of USAID and the goals we aim to achieve. The International Affairs Strategic Plan describes how USAID goals and those of other foreign affairs Agencies work together to support U.S. national interests. Both are being updated in 1999. These strategies describe *what we do*. To remain relevant and succeed however, USAID must adopt a culture where continuous learning, adapting, and improving becomes the norm. We must focus increasingly on *how we work* and look for ways to do our work more efficiently. This roadmap focuses on the latter. To provide a sense of direction to reform efforts, we provide here a general vision of *how* we want to work as we enter the twenty-first century. This vision summarizes what we hope to achieve through reform.

### **Reform Vision**

USAID seeks to evolve into a model twenty-first century international development agency that has the operational flexibility, technical skills, and institutional strength to meet twenty-first century global challenges. This means:

- ☐ Being dynamic and proactive in addressing both long-term development challenges and shorter-term crises that undermine sustained progress
- ☐ Selecting the most worthwhile goals, achieving success consistently, and demonstrating our impact
- ☐ Being recognized as a highly valued partner by our colleagues in other U.S. foreign affairs agencies, public, private and international donor organizations, and host country institutions
- ☐ Having a strong and flexible field presence which enables us to devise better programs, implement them more quickly, and avoid costly mistakes
- ☐ Applying the lessons of successes and failure systematically, and providing leadership in tackling complex problems that demand multi-agency or multi-donor responses
- ☐ Working more effectively and collaboratively with our implementing partners
- ☐ Improving our internal processes so that they are less costly to operate, more productive, and much more responsive to the customers they serve, both inside and outside of USAID

### III. How Are We Getting There?

The vision just outlined calls for an organization which has all of USAID's experience, field presence, and capabilities, but which is more consistently flexible, responsive, and efficient than ever before. Fortunately, the management concepts and practical approaches for achieving this exist. They have been developed over the past 15 years in private and public sector entities. As part of U.S. Government reinvention efforts, USAID started adopting these new approaches in 1994. To provide a common reference point, these concepts are briefly summarized here.

In essence, achieving improvements requires that we carry out an organizational transformation from the traditional fragmented hierarchy model to a more seamless structure, which focuses much more on desired outcomes and allows greater organizational flexibility for achieving them.

The organizational structure that USAID favored until 1994 was developed by private industry in the mid-1800s and adapted to U.S. government entities beginning in the 1860s. The underlying assumption for this type of organization is that employees do not share the same goals as the organization, and their behaviors must be made to conform to organizational needs. This assumption leads to structures and systems aimed at controlling the work of employees through use of detailed position descriptions; elaborate handbooks; division of responsibility among many actors; and establishment of extensive, multi-layered, hierarchical supervisory structures. The result is fragmented hierarchies. In these organizations, up to one third of all employees are devoted to the task of checking whether other employees are doing their work correctly. These organizations have certain advantages, such as a high capacity to produce standardized goods and services on a large scale, and being relatively easy to expand and enlarge. Their disadvantage lies in very high overhead costs, slowness in adapting to changing circumstances, and poor performance in customizing products and services to meet differing customer needs. Even more problematic perhaps, fragmented hierarchies typically nurture unspoken values and behaviors that become barriers to improved performance. The following implicit organizational values are familiar to anyone who has worked in this type of organization:

- ❑ "It's not my job."
- ❑ "It's not my problem."
- ❑ "Work processes should flow according to my convenience."
- ❑ "Accumulating turf is the key to promotions."
- ❑ "Decisions made up the hierarchy are always more correct than those made below."
- ❑ "We know what's best."

By contrast, in the modern seamless organization, the governing assumption is that employees seek to do well, and one only needs to create a good working environment to obtain high performance. A common starting point in reforming traditional organizations involves use of explicitly stated core values. These are intended to counter unproductive values, as well as to guide behavior and decision-making from a higher plane. In this context, core values serve as a broad statement on the behaviors that are sought in a wide range of situations. Voluminous handbooks can be shrunk, and staff time can be increasingly shifted from controlling work to achieving important results. USAID's five core values are typical of organizations going through such a reform process. They serve as a centerpiece and reference point for all reform efforts. As such it is worth repeating them:

### **USAID Core Values**

- ☐ Managing for Results
- ☐ Customer Focus
- ☐ Teamwork and Participation
- ☐ Empowerment and Accountability
- ☐ Valuing Diversity

With core values as a guide, reform processes typically include a mix of interventions such as:

- ☐ Refocusing overall strategy and clarifying goals
- ☐ Deregulation to reduce “input management” burden
- ☐ Restructuring
- ☐ Reengineering internal processes and systems
- ☐ Reengineering individual unit operations
- ☐ Expanding use of self-directed teams
- ☐ Intensive use of information technology to support reengineered processes

Carried out in a coordinated manner with a high degree of leadership, these interventions can result in major performance breakthroughs. Reforms are typically introduced in a three-stage process involving design, implementation, and alignment phases. The latter phase is considered essential to success, as new systems must be adjusted to each other to work well. Recent efforts to streamline field reporting (R4 process) are an example of aligning a recently designed system based on experience. Finally, it is worth noting that organization-wide reforms typically require three to ten years to become fully institutionalized. In USAID, reforms have been underway for about four years. The next two to three years will be critical to consolidate changes and achieve tangible and lasting performance improvements. If we slow down at this stage, we will be left with an incompatible mix of old and new structures, guidance, and processes, and the desired performance improvements will not materialize.

## **IV. Lessons Learned to Date**

USAID’s reform experience reveals some general problem areas as reflected in the recent reform stocktaking exercise. These lessons are summarized here to bring a sense of realism and guide the subsequent action plan.

**Differing Views Among Senior Agency Leadership:** Among senior management there will be differing views on need, urgency, approaches, and methodology of reforms. Insufficient leadership in providing direction through word and action is the most common problem encountered in public and private sector restructuring efforts. Clarity and consensus on a reform agenda and vision is needed as a basis for effective leadership. Repeated communication from senior managers is critical to impart a sense of urgency to the reform agenda and ensure that issues are addressed and resolved quickly.

**Managing Expectations:** Introducing change raises expectations. When everyone's expectations are not met, cynicism and delusion grows. Communication about expectations and progress becomes vital to keep reforms on track. We need more and better two-way communication involving agency leaders, staff, and partner organizations.

**Balancing Innovation With Life as a Federal Agency:** USAID is but part of a broader government structure. We often lack the authority to change externally imposed systems and processes (e.g., procurement and personnel regulations, budget earmarks, and certain delegations of authority). When facing these regulatory constraints, we need to be certain about which ones are real rather than imagined or internally created, and focus on those we can influence. At times this will mean communicating with external regulators and seeking relief.

**Balancing Teamwork and Hierarchy:** Using strategic objective (SO) teams at the bottom of an administrative hierarchy can be problematic when those higher up the chain lack familiarity with team structures, provide unclear or inconsistent delegation of authority, and repeatedly overturn team decisions. Strategic objective teams must also understand that mission management and others in the hierarchy are ultimately responsible for both development results and regulatory accountability, and must at times intervene. Teams are fundamentally different entities than offices, and they can be rendered ineffective by inappropriate management. We need to encourage use of teams at higher levels in the organization both to improve efficiency and broaden experience with this structure within the Agency. We also need to provide better guidance to teams on their role in a hierarchical context and the accountability requirements they must meet to merit greater decision-making authority.

**Managing Uncertainty:** Unraveling old systems can easily create the impression that chaos reigns, especially when information and training lags and guidance is incomplete. Inconsistency of new guidance and its application is a further source of confusion. We need to signal that some uncertainty is to be expected and can be tolerated. However, we also must quickly identify when it gets out of hand and respond appropriately.

**Training Becomes Critical:** In the absence of aggressive training efforts, changing basic systems and processes can quickly result in a decrease of institutional capacity, negating the intended effects of reforms. Furthermore, progress made in some units based on innovative experimentation can be lost simply due to the normal turnover of Foreign Service staff combined with insufficient sharing of experience. After an unfortunate hiatus, USAID is once again making training a priority. We must maintain that priority even if it means having a smaller but better trained staff. Training, and training funds, must be viewed as an integral part of agency systems, not an optional add-on component.

**System Overload:** Implementing organizational change while simultaneously pursuing development goals, downsizing staff, and meeting externally required mandates is difficult. Unlike private sector entities, which prefer to speed up reform, our resource and regulatory constraints force us to pace our efforts. This means we should seek to mainstream change processes to avoid over-dependency on temporary task forces that can result in poor follow-through and lack of institutional memory. This requires investments in training and consistent leadership.

**Evolving Performance Standards:** As a leader in USG reinvention efforts, USAID's efforts in the area of performance measurement are breaking new ground. Discussions with the Hill, OMB, and the



GAO show that standards for defining and measuring results are both flexible and evolving. Organizations like USAID whose results depend largely on the actions of external actors, have difficulty in meeting attribution and measurement standards that are the norm in conventional service-providing organizations. In order to obtain due credit for our important successes, USAID must continue to seek effective ways of providing performance assessments while keeping costs of measurement efforts reasonable. Continuing dialogue with our overseers is needed to reach consensus on workable standards and approaches.

**Unexpected Sources of Change:** As we proceed, we can expect, but not always plan for, external factors that will affect our ability to implement change as planned. Past examples include externally imposed downsizing and government shutdown. More recent is the Y2K problem that requires significant resources and efforts to address it.

## **V. Reform Action Plan—Agency Level**

At the Agencywide level, reform efforts over the next two years will concentrate on four principal areas: strengthening reform leadership, improving performance of critical Agencywide systems, improving Washington–field relations, and reform-related training.

### **A. Strengthening Reform Leadership**

A significant finding of the recent stocktaking effort is a strongly perceived lack of adequate leadership in promoting reform efforts. Some Agency managers and staff have applied reforms with excellent results. Too many have felt stymied, however, by a sense that the hierarchy does not provide adequate support or follow-through. This broadly felt concern is recognized in management literature as a common problem faced by organizations seeking to implement change. To address this issue, the following steps are being taken:

- 1. Improving Teamwork and Decision-Making at Senior Management Levels:** The Administrator, Deputy Administrator, and Assistant Administrators will seek to introduce better teamwork in senior management decision processes. This may include use of a management consultant to work with senior staff on teamwork development. The objective is to develop more “corporate” and efficient decision-making processes, expand experience with teamwork in the Agency, and provide an example of how teamwork can be used effectively at management levels above strategic objective teams.
- 2. Clarifying Reform Leadership:** The Assistant Administrators for M and PPC have been jointly delegated the authority and responsibility for providing overall reform leadership and management. This includes taking steps necessary to implement the plan described in this document in coordination with other bureaus. Individuals responsible for the various sections of this plan are identified in annex A. Efforts will be made to improve communications related to reforms between senior managers and staff through reform-related training and other venues.
- 3. Recognizing and Rewarding Executive Leadership:** All Assistant Administrators, Deputy Assistant Administrators, and SMG level staff are expected to provide reform leadership in

their respective units. To encourage the pro-active and time consuming efforts that are needed, special attention will be given to defining and encouraging positive management leadership behaviors, such as promotion of core values, through revisions in the Agency's Incentives Awards Program and Foreign Service Promotion Precepts.

4. **Ensuring Authoritative Interpretation of Operational Policies and Procedures:** Since April 1998, the Assistant Administrators for PPC and M have used the Operations Governance Team, a joint M-PPC coordination mechanism, to ensure that issues and questions about the new operating system are addressed, resolved, and communicated. The Team also receives suggestions for how to improve the way we do business.

## **B. Improving Agencywide Systems**

In carrying out its work across the globe, USAID depends on seven interrelated management systems that cut across bureau and office boundaries. Unfortunately, because work is fragmented across different organizational units, no one person has been responsible for any one system and overall efficiency is too often less than desired. Because of their importance, Washington-level reform efforts will continue to focus on these systems—starting with naming individuals responsible for overall functioning of each system (see annex A). The primary objective is to reduce cost, improve performance, and thereby allow a greater portion of resources to be applied to achieving development results in the field. The second objective is to increase consistency between these systems in terms of promoting core values. To achieve this, core values will be used as a reference point to guide and evaluate system improvements. Staff and partner feedback will be sought to assess system performance and identify conflicts. Effective teamwork across organizational boundaries will be needed to make improvements. The seven systems are as follows:

1. **Managing for Results System:** Through this system, the results USAID seeks to achieve are defined and agreed upon, and the budgets needed to achieve them developed. Specifically, overall Agency strategy and policies are developed, country presence is determined, and programs are established, implemented, evaluated, and terminated. Agreements are reached and maintained through the Agency Strategic Plan, Country Strategic Plans, R4s, bureau and Agency budget requests, Congressional Presentations, Annual Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Report, as well as all activity-level approval documentation. All defined results, whether at the Agency or country level must meet appropriate performance measurement standards. All activities funded must meet a significant number of regulatory and policy criteria and be technically sound. PPC and M (for budget) have overall responsibility for defining standards and improving system processes with input and feedback from bureaus, missions, partners, and stakeholders. The Agency's technical staff plays the leading role in defining technically sound results and strategies to achieve them.
2. **Funding Allocation System:** When Congress appropriates funds against the results and budgets proposed through our managing for results system, the funding allocation system makes these funds available to obligating officials throughout the Agency. Key steps managed by our central budget office (M/B) include interpreting congressional appropriation and committee reports (earmarks and directives), and brokering and allotting budget levels to

bureaus. Bureau managers then make allowances to missions and Washington operating units. Finally, strategic objective teams decide on levels for individual obligation instruments and activities. Delays in this process directly and negatively impact on our ability to achieve timely results.

- 3. Acquisition and Assistance System:** The acquisition and assistance system provides the framework for provisions of funding from USAID (through its obligating and sub-obligating officials) to external entities including all types of profit, nonprofit, governmental, and nongovernmental institutions around the world. It formalizes our relationship with institutions that receive USAID funding, and specifies accountability and performance requirements that apply in each case. A variety of formal instruments are used for this purpose including contracts, grants, cooperative agreements, bilateral agreements, and various interagency transfer instruments. Authorized USAID officials include assistant administrators and mission directors who obligate funds with governmental entities, delegated SO team staff who may sub-obligate certain funds, and contracts officers who have a lead role in obligating or sub-obligating funds to nongovernmental entities. Executive officers also have certain authorities. Preparation of instruments involves a wide range of USAID staff with many different specialty areas (technical, program, controller, contracts, and legal). GC has a lead role in obligations involving governmental entities. (Contracts and grants are also used to manage parts of the USAID workforce, but this function is included as part of the workforce management system below.)
- 4. Funds Accounting System:** This includes accounting for and reporting on the status of all appropriated funds including uncommitted balances, commitments, obligations, sub-obligations and expenditures. Current reform efforts include the procurement and adaptation of a core accounting system, and development of a managerial cost accounting system to meet new federal requirements.
- 5. Workforce Management System:** This system plans for and manages the USAID workforce including classification, recruitment, training, assignment, compensation, awards, promotions, and retirement. Responsibility is split among several units. M/HR has a lead role for the OE-funded direct hire workforce, and the foreign national workforce overseas (FSNs). M/OP has the lead for certain program-funded positions (USPSCs, RSSAs, PASAs). Various bureaus have a lead with respect to other program-funded positions (fellows, TAACs). ES has a lead role in AD technical staff allocations and selection. For all categories, many staff members in all bureaus are involved in decision-making. These divisions make it difficult to view workforce planning and development in an integrated manner. Training is unique in that it supports all reform initiatives in this roadmap and, in a sense, integrates them. It is particularly critical that the entire USAID workforce has access to reform-related training developed by M/HR.
- 6. Information Management Systems:** Information management includes all information technology aimed at facilitating the work of Agency staff, while reducing cost and improving performance of the systems described above. This technology must meet USG information management standards. This includes providing Y2K-compliant desktops with increased access to computer networks (such as the Internet), elaborating Y2K contingency plans, and developing the New Management System. M has a leading role. AMS and EXO staff in all

bureaus manage portions of this system.

- 7. Automated Directives System (ADS):** This system produces and disseminates all written guidance related to Agency operating procedures across all of the systems described above. This includes the new reengineered handbooks (sometimes referred to as the “ADS”), currently active portions of old handbooks, Agency policies, contract information bulletins, Agency notices, bureau notices, all delegations of authority, and all mission-level notices. To be effective and useful, guidance at all levels has to be accessible, complete, and consistent in reflecting reform principles and USG results-management standards. M, PPC, and GC at the Agency-wide level, and Missions at the field level are responsible for this system.

A significant amount of effort is now being directed at improving performance of these systems. On-going and planned actions are summarized in annex A.

### **C. Improving Washington–Field Relations**

A significant feedback from the November 1998 Mission Directors’ Conference was a call to improve Washington–field relations with respect to:

- ☐ Program and staffing support to missions. This need is particularly acute for small missions which are increasing in number
- ☐ Information flow and coordination between field and centrally managed programs
- ☐ Clarification of roles and responsibilities at the field level with respect to the Department of State

Generally, missions would benefit from greater customer orientation and results management on the part of Washington bureaus. Cultivating results-management at a Washington level means shifting emphasis from the traditional input-focused, second-guessing approach, to one that is led by a sense of shared responsibility for results achievement. With this emphasis more dominant, bureaus can focus on streamlining and reducing bureaucratic requirements, and responding effectively to staffing constraints and other bottlenecks affecting field efforts. Significant coordination issues have been identified with respect to certain central bureau programs and missions. While full resolution will depend in part on better information technology (under development), much can be done in the short term simply through better communication between units (formal and informal). Each bureau will develop specific efforts to address these issues. Those efforts will be detailed more fully in annex A. With respect to clarifying our relationship with the Department of State, PPC-led efforts are currently underway to better define coordination mechanisms at all levels. Recent R4 and MPP guidance has been closely coordinated with State. Additional guidance on other areas will be gradually developed.

### **D. Reform-Related Training**

Reform efforts are highly dependent on training and learning to be successful. The Office of Human Resources, in close collaboration with PPC, M, and GC, as well as employees throughout the Agency, is designing and implementing a new Agencywide training program with organization development support components. Effort will be made to include partner organizations where useful and appropriate. Portions of this program that specifically relate to reform efforts include the following:

- 1. Leadership and Program Operations (LPO) Program:** A new comprehensive training-learning curriculum for all categories of USAID employees worldwide, in five major skill areas including senior-level reform leadership, managing for results (incorporating strategic planning, activity planning, performance measurement, and acquisition and assistance management), team leadership, teamwork, and organization and operations. This program will be piloted in CY 1999 and fully operational by CY 2000.
- 2. Interim Leadership and Program Operations courses including:** Reaching-4-Results, orientation for new mission directors, acquisition and assistance management for mission directors, new entry training, grants management, performance-based management, and cognizant technical officer (CTO) training. This program has been underway with renewed efforts in 1998, and will continue until the new program is phased in.
- 3. New Competency-Based Technical Program:** This is a new program aimed at building skills and knowledge for the Agency's technical employees. During the next two years, this will be limited to one or two technical sectors.

## **VI. Reform Action Plan—Operating Unit Level**

Each mission and Washington operating unit is asked to develop its own reform action plan. These plans should aim to promote the reform vision and core values described in this document. Efforts should concentrate on producing four outcomes:

- ☐ Empowered staff and teams accountable for development results
- ☐ Results-oriented program management and decision-making
- ☐ Development needs identified and strategies developed with customer and partner involvement
- ☐ Responsive and flexible approaches for achieving results

The following action areas are provided as a menu to assist in unit-level reform planning. A common menu is useful in that it promotes shared experience across missions and helps ensure that alignment of new systems takes place more quickly. Operating units should select from the items below those areas of action that they feel are most needed.

**A. Strengthen Strategic Objective Team Functioning:** SO teams were introduced in USAID as a means to better involve in-country partners and stakeholders, and improve the efficiency and flexibility of implementation efforts. Experience with their use has varied widely. Once they experience it, many staff find they prefer working in real teams. Some teams however, exist more in name than in practice. In most cases, there is opportunity for strengthening team functioning. Common areas of need include: clarifying management's role vis-a-vis teams through team charters or management contracts which clarify authorities and scope of decision-making; developing team leadership and membership skills; and increasing involvement of non-USAID team members in decision-making.

- B. Improve Internal Customer Services:** SO teams are highly dependent on services provided by various support units (controller, contracts, legal, program, project development, and executive offices). Such support units can significantly improve their contribution to both reforms and development results, by reviewing how they approach their work. SO teams are most effective when support units seek first to: a) clarify the accountability standards and processes they are expert in; b) ensure that key information on standards and processes is provided at the right time to SO teams; and c) help teams to achieve accountability and process standards. A second role of support units is to provide feedback to senior management (the other main customer of support units) on the effectiveness with which different SO teams are able to manage and meet the many accountability requirements they are responsible for. Management confidence is increased when SO teams and support units are working well together. This confidence is necessary to permit full delegation of authority to SO teams. Use of simple internal customer surveys (with SO team staff and mission management as two main categories of customers) is a good way for functional support units to identify highest priority SO team needs and effective support practices.
- C. Promote Results-Oriented Management and Customer Focus:** There are a number of steps that missions can consider to further strengthen achievement of development results. These include eliminating activities that do not have a close link to, or tangible impact on, strategic objectives; ensuring that grantee and contractor staff are aware of the results they are expected to contribute to (both through appropriate language in grant or contract documents and verbal reinforcement); and reviewing performance indicators and making changes requested in the new R4 guidance aimed at improving cost effectiveness. Results can be achieved through various techniques (surveys, rapid appraisal, informal interviews, active participation), determining whether ultimate customers are likely to support and contribute effectively to intended development results and take appropriate action based on this information (modify activities, seek interested customers, or change objectives) and institutionalizing regular partner and stakeholder feedback on programs and activities (through SO team meetings organized for that purpose and/or other venues).
- D. Reduce and Update Mission Notices to Reflect SO Team Structures and Core Values:** Missions normally maintain large sets of notices that specify internal operating procedures and delegations of authority. Introduction of core values and SO team structures have made many of these notices obsolete or at least imperfect tools, for supporting reforms. While many notices are intended to help meet externally imposed regulations or manage customer demands on service providing units, the degree to which costly new rules and bureaucracy can be added in the process is striking. Every notice has a price tag or cost, as it generates some degree of administrative overhead and audit exposure. Useful notices reduce costs more than they create them. Missions are encouraged to deregulate to the extent feasible by deleting those notices that do not support current systems or that can not be shown to reduce the general cost of operation and results achievement.
- E. Use Staff Performance Appraisals to Encourage Reforms:** Ensure that all staff evaluations are drafted with active use of 360-degree feedback (particularly involving internal customers), that mission evaluation committees reward behaviors that reflect core values and that employee evaluations and feedback reflect the appraisal committee's broader view.
- F. Selective Reengineering Efforts:** If your mission unit is persistently hampered by internal

processes that do not seem to work well and opportunities exist to significantly improve some area of Mission operations, you are encouraged to design and implement corrective improvements and communicate your successes to Washington and other interested missions.

## **VII. Measuring Progress**

Progress in carrying out reforms will be measured in three general ways.

- A. Establishment of Process Performance Standards for Agencywide Systems:** Process performance measures or benchmarks will be developed for appropriate parts of the seven major Agency systems described above (section V, part B.). These standards will be selected to reflect needs of principal system customers. For ADS guidance, this may include selective “truth-testing” whereby users score guidance by how well it promotes core values while ensuring adherence to externally imposed regulations.
- B. Periodic Formal Stocktaking Effort:** The recent stocktaking exercise, involving both USAID staff and partners, provided a wealth of feedback on reform efforts. This was the first attempt to collect large-scale information on the impact of reforms. It is intended that similar but smaller efforts be conducted on a regular basis, while a full-scale effort of the type conducted in 1998 would take place every three years as needed.
- C. Annual Performance Report:** As part of its Annual Performance Report to the Congress, USAID discusses progress in management reforms. This roadmap and its annex will provide the structure for summarizing overall progress.

# **Annex A**

## **USAID Reform Roadmap Action Plan**

### **1999-2000**

*The matrix in this annex lists the main reform tasks and completion targets.*

This information will be used as a management tool to track progress and draft the Annual Performance Report section on USAID reforms for the Hill and OMB. The tasks listed in the matrix cut across units and focus on systems. The matrix is not a work plan for individual offices. This matrix focuses on Washington managed reform efforts. These are supplemented by reform efforts initiated by individual field missions per section VI of the roadmap.

The matrix will be revised periodically to record accomplishments and add new items as needed. Please contact Olivier Carduner, PPC and/or Carrie Johnson, M for questions and inputs.



# Table of Contents

<b>A. REFORM LEADERSHIP:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B. AGENCY WIDE SYSTEMS</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>1. Managing for Results: Dirk Dijkerman (DAA/PPC)</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2. Funding Allocation: Jim Painter (M/B)</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>3. Acquisition and Assistance: Terry Brown (AA/M)</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>4. Funds Accounting System: Tony Cully (M/FM) and Dirk Dijkerman (PPC)</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>5. Workforce Management System: Linda Lion (DAA/M/HR) and Rodney Johnson (M/OP)</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>6. Information Management Systems: Rick Nygard (DAA/M)</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>7. Automated Directives System: Larry Tanner (PPC)</i>	<i>11</i>
<b>C. WASHINGTON-FIELD RELATIONS (CONTACT AND TARGETS TBD)</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>D. REFORM-RELATED TRAINING: CATHY SMITH (M/HR/LS)</b>	<b>13</b>

Last Revised: 04/02/1999 1:30 PM

## A. REFORM LEADERSHIP:

Tom Fox (AA/PPC) and Terry Brown (AA/M)

(Section last revised 04/01/1999 12:48 PM)

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	By September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Improve Teamwork and Decision Making at Senior Management Levels	Terry Brown, AA/M Tom Fox, AA/PPC	A. Re-invigorate the AAs' lunches, with agendas and focus on "corporate culture" B. Develop new understandings/systems for State-USAID coordination	A. Succeed in completing workforce planning exercise, without relying solely on A/AID resolution B. Give detailed oral report on progress to Change-Agent Group. C. Issue new guidance on USAID-Dept of State coordination		
Clarify Reform Leadership	Terry Brown, AA/M Tom Fox, AA/PPC	Give monthly briefings to Tuesday Senior Staff meetings on Operations Governance and the Reform Roadmap	Initiate Roadmap Progress Review for Annual Performance Report to Congress.		
New core value focused performance precepts developed for FS promotion, tenuring and IDI graduation	Betsy Brown, M/HR Steve Gomez, M/HR	A. New performance precepts drafted 12/30/98 B. Precepts circulated for management approval and negotiated with AFSA 2/5/99	A. New precept guidance issued for Performance Boards (3/99) B. Precepts applied for 1999 assignment decisions and 2000 prom. cycle		
Agency awards and incentives policies, Procedures and processes reengineered & focused on promoting core values	Joann Jones, M/HR	Working group convened 8/98	A. Reform proposal sent to A/AID for approval (4/99) B. Implementing policies/procedures drafted and cleared (5/99) C. Uniton negotiations completed (6/99) D. General notice issued for rollout of new program (7/99)		
PPC-M Operations Governance Team ensures that issues of operational policy are resolved and communicated	Diane Lavoy, PPC Pam Callen, M/B	Report to Senior Staff on Operations issues resolved in past 12 months, and priority issues targeted for 1999 resolution.	TBD		

## B. AGENCY WIDE SYSTEMS

### 1. Managing for Results: Dirk Dijkerman (DAA/PPC)

(Section last revised 04/01/1999 4:08 PM)

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
A. Develop Cost Effective Approach to Implement Results Act and Related Legislation and reach agreement with OMB and Congress – this involves reviewing and adjusting USAID procedures for strategic planning and performance monitoring at both country and Agency levels.	Gerry Britan, PPC Olivier Carduner, PPC Fran Carr, PPC Jim Painter, M/B Barbara Bennett, LPA Jan Miller, GC	A. Begin discussions with Congress, GAO, OMB, and IG, partner organizations on resolving methodological issues related to GPRA performance planning and reporting. (10/98) B. Revise approach to Annual Performance Plan to better reflect methodological constraints to performance reporting and efforts made to address them (3/99) C. Revise approach to Annual Performance Report (3/99) D. Assess and share USAID and other donor experience on use of indicators with OMB, IG, GAO and other USG Agencies. E. Clarify USAID reporting requirements with respect to IASP (2/99). F. Provide content update to MFR training efforts.	A. Revise Agency Strategic Plan to address strategic direction and planning issues. B. Negotiate revisions to Congressional Presentation. C. Reach agreement with Congress, GAO, and OMB, on approaches to resolving planning and performance measurement issues. D. Develop Agency policy and decision making procedures to normalize country presence decision making. E. Participate in new training pilot efforts and assist in revising MRF related content. F. Revise ADS guidance pertaining to country, regional and global strategic planning and performance monitoring.	A. Ensure that revised GPRA and GMRA planning, monitoring and reporting work processes are fully supported by new financial and cost accounting software design.	A. Assess experience with revised GPRA systems and make adjustments if necessary to ensure cost-effectiveness.
B. Improve Quality and Cost Effectiveness of Performance Management and Reporting by Operating Units	Gerry Britan, PPC Olivier Carduner, PPC Fran Carr, PPC Jim Painter, M/B	A. Develop improved performance measurement standards and guidance to operating units (TIPS 12 11/99). B. Improve flow of communication between Washington and field on experience with indicators.	A. Revise ADS guidance pertaining to activity – level planning to maximize cost reduction advantages of decentralized planning while improving flexibility of response and linkage to Washington performance reporting.	A. FY 2002 R4 guidance incorporates adjustments based on experience. B. Facilitate greater BHR integration with strategic planning and R4 procedures.	

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
		C. Revise R4 reporting guidance for FY2001 R4 to reduce cost and improve quality of reporting (12/99) D. Provide briefings to USAID and partner staff on R4 and MFR changes. E. Revise G Bureau R4 procedures to eliminate duplication with Mission R4s.	B. Review 1999 R4 experience and begin development of next year's guidance. C. Complete improved Goal area reviews to assess results achievement, plan budgets and identify most cost-effective performance assessment approaches, including use of standard indicators for agency-wide reporting.		
C . Improve use of performance information in USAID/W strategy and budget decision making.	Gerry Britan, PPC Olivier Carduner, PPC Fran Carr, PPC Jim Painter, M/B	A. Develop plan to streamline process for using R4 information in production of APP, APR, ABS and Congressional Presentation (3/99)	A. Streamlined R4 to APP/APR/ABS/CP process implemented.	A. Assess degree to which revised approach improves results management and reporting quality.	
D. Assess and modify checks and balances in planning and performance management to assure quality of Agency programs.	Gerry Britan, PPC Olivier Carduner, PPC Fran Carr, PPC Jim Painter, M/B	A. Review and revise PPC role in Strategic Plan review and approval process to focus more on assisting units to achieve reasonable high quality planning standards. B. Provide inputs to M/HR for modification of promotion precepts to support effective results management (including risk taking)	A. Based on case studies, assess issues faced by units in developing effective strategies, develop appropriate responses to problem areas and identify best practices. B. Develop guidance for strategic planning and reporting in non-presence countries. C. Update Internal Control Assessment to include performance measurement standards		

**B. AGENCY WIDE SYSTEMS cont.**

**2. Funding Allocation: Jim Painter (M/B)**

*(Section last revised 3/10/99)*

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Improve OYB Allocation Process from M/B to Bureaus	Pam Callen, M/B	Initiate inter-bureau business process improvement effort & develop recommendations (report completed 2/99)	A. Review & approve recommendations (5/99) B. Implement recommendations (5/99-12/00) C. Establish performance measures (begin 6/99)	Performance against first half FY 00 targets assessed	Performance against FY 00 targets assessed
Improve OYB Allocation Process from Bureaus to Missions	Program offices in regional bureaus		Regional bureaus initiate review of OYB transfer process, develop plan for streamlining, and establish funds transfer benchmark targets	Performance against first half FY 00 targets assessed	Performance against FY 00 targets assessed

**3. Acquisition and Assistance: Terry Brown (AA/M)**

*(Section last revised 04/01/1999 12:52 PM)*

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Improve A&A system	Marcus Stevenson (M/OP) and Rodney Johnson (M/OP)		A. Complete and implement BPIs (streamlining). B. Establish and have full functioning A&A Advisory Panel (AAP) (teamwork). C. Complete OP organizational study and vet recommendations.	A. Implement an improved and fully integrated A&A Planning System (streamlining). B. Implement agreed upon recommendations and strategies for the organizational structure of OP in relating to clients (teamwork).	Entire A&A system understood and integrated into agency strategies and reforms as opposed to being perceived a separate and stand-alone process
Training in Direct Support of A&A system	Cathy Smith, M/HR/LS	Recommendations of A and A Task Force implemented in HR/LS training plans - 6/98			

**B. AGENCY WIDE SYSTEMS cont.**

***4. Funds Accounting System: Tony Cully (M/FM) and Dirk Dijkerman (PPC)***

*(Section last revised 04/01/1999 12:53 PM)*

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Develop Management Cost Accounting System (MCA) to be consistent with GPRA Approach on Attribution	Tony Cully (M/FM) and Tom Rishoi (PPC)	Begin MCA pilots	Completion of management cost accounting methodology	Software configuration identified	Software implementation in AID/W

## B. AGENCY WIDE SYSTEMS cont.

### 5. Workforce Management System: Linda Lion (DAA/M/HR) and Rodney Johnson (M/OP)

(Section last revised 04/01/1999 1:14 PM)

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
FS Selection Boards policies, procedures, and processes reengineered	Ronnie Daniel	Completed 5/98			
Senior Management Group (SMG) policies, procedures and processes reengineered	Linda Lion	Completed 8/98			
FS open assignments policies, procedures and processes reengineered	Ronnie Daniel	Business Process Improvement analysis completed 10/98 Partial implementation of some recommendations completed 11/98		Full implementation of some recommendations completed 11/99	
GS merit promotion policies, procedures and processes reengineered	Tim Winchell	Analysis of problems completed 10/98 AMSs Briefed 11/98 Internal flow of SPARS/SF52s/SF50s revised 11/98 SF 52 MACRO in place 1/99 Training on Merit Promotion ADS chapter implemented 1/99 Final BPI report issued 1/99	On-line staffing pattern established 4/99		
IDI recruitment program revitalized and streamlined	Audrey Minkley		IDI Recruitment SOP document completed 6/99 Class I of about 30 IDIs brought on board 9/99	Class II of about 30 IDIs brought on board 3/00	Class III of about 30 IDIs brought on board 9/00

## 5. Workforce Management System cont.

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
New standardized and automated system (COHO) for GS position classification implemented. FS position management, position classification and backstop systems revised and modernized for USDH overseas and in USAID/W	Anita Stalls Doug Brandi	Classification/Position Management Process Improvement Team established - 8/98 COHO purchased - 8/98 Data Base Administrators (3) trained; HR management and Team briefed - 10/98 Team divided into sub-groups to address various implementation issues - 11/98 Customization of COHO data base initiated - 11/98 Team Charter approved - 12/98 Performance Measurement Plan finalized - 1/99	Rollout of COHO conducted and new procedures and protocols tested - 4/99 Initial rollout evaluated - 6/99 Procedures and protocols evaluated - 7/99	Second rollout of COHO implemented - 12/99 Survey in AID/W - 3/00	Report on second rollout - 5/00
USAID/W position management plan developed	Larry Brown	Agency Position Management Review 1/99 Recommendations evaluated by M Bureau 3/99	Position Management Plan developed Action Plan Outline for review 4/99 AA/M approval 5/99 Agency Management Council endorsement 6/99 Position Management Plan Phased Roll-out Organization reviews consolidated in M/HR 7/99 Cost Analysis Process developed M/HR/PPIM, M/B and M/HR/POD collaboration 8/99	Cost Analysis model approved and disseminated 10/99 Ceiling Allocation Process integration 11/99 Skills Inventory software developed 1/00	Position Management Policy and Procedures fully described and incorporated into a new ADS 102, reviewed and approved by the Unions, and issued. 4/00



## 5. Workforce Management System cont.

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Guidance to Missions on Important Aspects of FSN Personnel Management	Tim Beaty Tim Winchell		Draft completed for review by HR staff 4/99 Draft released to field for comment 6/99 Comments from field 8/99	Publish final guidance 10/99	
A new career-counseling program for both GS and FS employees worldwide designed and implemented.	Cathy Smith	TBD			
Commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) automated Human Resources system procured and installed to replace existing RAMPS system	Doug Brandi	TBD			
Regularize PSC competition and administration (consistency)	Rodney Johnson (M/OP)	TBD			

## B. AGENCY WIDE SYSTEMS cont.

### 6. Information Management Systems: Rick Nygard (DAA/M)

(Section last revised 04/01/1999 1:01 PM)

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Y2K Compliance on all USAID desktops, servers and internet web connections	M/IRM, J. Streufert		USAID desktops are Y2K compliant.	Evaluate status of other than mission critical systems.	Assure close-out of program for mission critical systems including lessons learned.
Web Access for all Missions	M/IRM, Darrell Owen		Identify Field solution for local Internet Services Provider (ISP) access.	A. Realign Agency communications budget for pay according to use. B. Take lessons learned from supplemental sites. C. Implement improved information systems security measures for AIDNET, critical systems and applications, and mission operations.	A. Procurement actions for pay according to use plan, where business cases called for service. B. Implement improved information systems security measures for program information technology initiatives.
NMS Development	DAA/M, R. Nygard, Chief Information Officer and M/FM, Mike Smokovich, Chief Financial Officer		A. Agency information technology architecture (ITA) is refined. B. IT capital investment to replace NMS AWACS approved and solicitation issued for commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) core accounting system. C. Disciplined software acquisition project management practices are applied to COTS core accounting system acquisition. D. Modernization plan for integrated financial systems program developed	A. COTS core accounting system is procured and configuration of package is underway. B. IT capital investment planning & monitoring process is defined. C. Formal IT risk management processes are defined.	A. Agency Information Management (IM) Strategic Plan adopted. B. Agency ITA updated. C. JFMIP-compliant COTS core accounting system implemented in USAID/W to enhance resource management and overseas deployment plan is approved. D. IT capital investments approved & acquisition planning initiated to replace priority administrative systems.

## 6. Information Management Systems cont.

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Computer Training Program implemented in Washington	Doris Hall, M/HR/LS	Washington training plan for conversion from Windows 3.1 to Windows95 approved by the USAID Capital Investment Review Board 10/98	Approximately 1600 Washington employees trained in Windows95 desktop suite 3/99	Transition to single vendor completed for software development, hardware installation, and computer training services 11/99	Training program for conversion from NMS version 4 to NMS version 5 (or its successor) completed 12/00
Training in Direct Support of IT reforms	Cathy Smith, M/HR/LS	Collaboration initiated between M/IRM and M/HR/LS resulting in funding of master training plan for IT professionals - 2/98	Collaboration initiated between M/IRM and M/HR/LS resulting in revisions of master training plan for IT professionals - 9/99		

B. AGENCY WIDE SYSTEMS cont.

**7. Automated Directives System: Larry Tanner (PPC)**

(Section last revised 04/01/1999 1:02 PM)

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Improve ADS Accessibility	Larry Tanner, PPC	Define scope of ADS (Done) Develop Routine monthly notices to give authoritative updates. (Done)	Ensure staff access to CD roms thru Y2K-compliant computers.		
Improve ADS governance	Larry Laird, PPC		A. Revised Chapter 501 B. Improved quality of reviews C. Improved quality of drafting		
All HR ADS chapters finalized and all HR handbook chapters retired	Bob Egge, HR		All HR ADS chapters finalized and all HR handbook chapters retired by 6/30/99		
Revise ADS 200	Olivier Carduner, PPC Larry Laird, PPC	A. Identify inconsistencies in current ADS text and initiate revisions. B. Determine scope and timetable of substantive revisions per MFR System improvement work.	TBD	TBD	

## C. WASHINGTON-FIELD RELATIONS (CONTACT and TARGETS TBD)

(Section last revised 04/01/1999 1:02 PM)

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Increased and improved programmatic and staffing support to field Missions (esp. for small missions)	ENI: LAC: ANE: AFR: G: BHR:		TBD		
Increased and improved information flow and coordination between field and centrally managed programs	TBD		TBD		
Clarify roles and responsibilities of field Missions with respect to strategy coordination with Dept. of State.	Tom Fox, AA/PPC Ted Morse, PPC Olivier Carduner, PPC	A. R4 and MPP guidance coordinated with DOS (12/98 & 2/99) B. IASP revisions negotiated with DOS (1/99) C. Supplemental MPP guidance proposed to DOS for USAID field programs (2/99)	A. Guidance issued on State-USAID coordination at country-level		

## D. REFORM-RELATED TRAINING: Cathy Smith (M/HR/LS)

(Section last revised 04/01/1999 1:04 PM)

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Leadership and Program Operations Program, a new comprehensive training-learning curriculum for all categories of USAID employees worldwide, designed and implemented in five major skills of : Senior Leadership Managing for Results Leadership Teamwork Organization and Operations	Christine Glaubach, M/HR/LS	RFP Closed - 4/98 Contract Signed - 9/98	Modules designed and piloted: Sr. Leadership - 7/99 Mgt. for Results - 6/99 Org. & Opns. - 10/99 Teamwork - 11/99	Modules designed and piloted: Org. & Opns. - 10/99 Teamwork - 11/99 Leadership - 1/00 Curriculum fully implemented - 3/00	A. Full off-site training program under implementation world-wide B. All mission and bureaus have initiated CDROM modules with staff

## D. REFORM-RELATED TRAINING cont.

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
Interim Leadership and Program Operations courses delivered pending full implementation of new comprehensive curriculum (see above)	Cathy Smith, M/HR/LS  Rita Owens, M/HR/OD (Reaching-4-Results)	A. New Entry course delivered to 34 employees - 2/98, 12/98 B. Senior USAID managers (5) enrolled in Foreign Affairs Leadership Seminar @ State - 1/98, 5/98 C. New Reaching-4-Results course piloted in Washington - 6/98 D. Orientation Course for New Mission Directors delivered to 41 managers - 6/98, 7/98 E. Acquisition & Assistance Mgt. For Mission Directors course delivered to 63 managers - 6/98, 7/98, 11/98 F. Reaching-4-Results course delivered worldwide to approximately 180 employees- 12/98 G. Contract for new Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) course signed - 9/98 H. New Performance Based Contracting course piloted in Washington - 11/98 I. Grants Mgt course delivered to about 97 employees worldwide- 11/98 J. Reaching-4-Results course expanded from 5 to 7 days worldwide - 1/99 K. Senior USAID managers (6) enrolled in Foreign Affairs Leadership Seminar @ State - 1/99, 4/99, 9/99 L. New CTO course piloted in Washington - 2/99	A. Performance Based Contracting course delivered - 5/99 B. Orientation Course for New Mission Directors delivered - 6/99 C. Acquisition and Assistance Management for Mission Directors course delivered - 6/99 D. Grants Mgt course delivered - 6/99 E. New Entry course delivered - 9/99	A. Senior USAID managers enrolled in Foreign Affairs Leadership Seminar @ State - 1/00, 4/00, 9/00 B. Reaching-4-Results and other interim courses incorporated into Leadership and Program Operations curriculum - 3/00	TBD

## D. REFORM-RELATED TRAINING cont.

REFORM EFFORT	CONTACT	TARGET COMPLETION DATES			
		by March 1999	by September 1999	by March 2000	by September 2000
New competency-based technical training program for 1-2 technical sectors designed	Cathy Smith, M/HR/LS	Interim training, primarily workshops, provided to approximately 800 technical employees worldwide sponsored by Global Bureau		Benchmarking with other federal agencies completed and core competencies identified in collaboration with technical officers worldwide 12/99	Pilot program designed and staffed 12/00
Training Efforts in Direct Support of Other USAID Reform Roadmap Initiatives implemented	Cathy Smith, M/HR/LS	<p>A. Collaboration between PPC/CDIE and HR/LS resulted in co-sponsorship of Summer Seminar Series - 6/98</p> <p>B. M/B and HR/LS collaboration resulted in delivery of Federal Appropriations Law courses for technical staff - 11/98</p> <p>Recommendations of Acquisition and Acquisition Task Force implemented in HR/LS training plans - 6/98</p> <p>Collaboration initiated between M/IRM and M/HR/LS resulting in funding of master training plan for IT professionals - 2/98</p>	<p>A. Collaboration between PPC and HR/LS resulted in co-sponsorship of Summer Seminar Series - 6/99</p> <p>B. Collaboration initiated between M/IRM and M/HR/LS resulting in revisions of master training plan for IT professionals - 9/99</p>		